

ORIGINAL ARTICLE | CRITICAL CARE REVIEWS MEETING 2024

A Patient-Level Meta-Analysis of Intensive Glucose Control in Critically Ill Adults

Derick Adigbli, M.B.B.S., Ph.D.,^{1,2,3,4} Yang Li, H.Sc.D.,¹ Naomi Hammond Ph.D.,^{1,5} Richard Chatoor, M.D.,⁵ Anthony G. Devaux, Ph.D.,⁶ Qiang Li, M.Biostat.,⁶ Laurent Billot, M.Res.,⁶ Djillali Annane, M.D., Ph.D.,^{7,8,9,10} Yaseen Arabi, M.D.,¹¹ Federico Bilotta, M.D.,¹² Julien Bohé, M.D., Ph.D.,¹³ Frank Martin Brunkhorst, M.D., Ph.D.,¹⁴ Alexandre Biasi Cavalcanti M.D., Ph.D.,¹⁵ Deborah Cook, M.D., M.Sc.,¹⁶ Christoph Engel, M.D.,¹⁷ Deborah Green-LaRoche, M.D.,¹⁸ Wei He, M.D.,¹⁹ William Henderson, M.D., Ph.D.,²⁰ Cornelia Hoedemaekers, M.D., Ph.D.,²¹ Gaetano Iapichino, M.D.,²² Pierre Kalfon, M.D., Ph.D.,²³ Gisela de La Rosa, M.D.,²⁴ Afsaneh Lahooti, Ph.D.,^{1,25} Iain Mackenzie, D.M.,²⁶ Sajeev Mahendran, M.D.,^{6,27} Christian Mélot, M.D., Ph.D.,²⁸ Imogen Mitchell, M.B., Ph.D.,^{29,30} Tuomas Oksanen, M.D., Ph.D.,³¹ Federico Polli, M.D.,³² Jean-Charles Preiser, M.D., Ph.D.,³³ Francisco Garcia Soriano, M.D., Ph.D.,³⁴ Ruan Vlok, M.B.B.S.,^{1,35} Lingcong Wang, M.D., Ph.D.,³⁶ Yuan Xu, M.D.,³⁷ Anthony P. Delaney, M.D., Ph.D.,^{1,6,27} Gian Luca Di Tanna, Ph.D., M.Phil.,^{4,38,39} and Simon Finfer, M.D.^{1,40,41}

Abstract

BACKGROUND Whether intensive glucose control reduces mortality in critically ill patients remains uncertain. Patient-level meta-analyses can provide more precise estimates of treatment effects than are currently available.

METHODS We pooled individual patient data from randomized trials investigating intensive glucose control in critically ill adults. The primary outcome was in-hospital mortality. Secondary outcomes included survival to 90 days and time to live cessation of treatment with vasopressors or inotropes, mechanical ventilation, and newly commenced renal replacement. Severe hypoglycemia was a safety outcome.

RESULTS Of 38 eligible trials (n=29,537 participants), 20 (n=14,171 participants) provided individual patient data including in-hospital mortality status for 7059 and 7049 participants allocated to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively. Of these 1930 (27.3%) and 1891 (26.8%) individuals assigned to intensive and conventional control, respectively, died (risk ratio, 1.02; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.96 to 1.07; P=0.52; moderate certainty). There was no apparent heterogeneity of treatment effect on in-hospital mortality in any examined subgroups. Intensive glucose control increased the risk of severe hypoglycemia (risk ratio, 3.38; 95% CI, 2.99 to 3.83; P<0.0001).

CONCLUSIONS Intensive glucose control was not associated with reduced mortality risk but increased the risk of severe hypoglycemia. We did not identify a subgroup of patients in whom intensive glucose control was beneficial. (Funded by the Australian National

Dr. Di Tanna and Dr. Finfer are senior authors of this article.

The author affiliations are listed at the end of the article.

Dr. Finfer can be contacted at sfinfer@georgeinstitute.org.au or at The George Institute for Global Health, Level 18, Barangaroo International Tower 3, 300 Barangaroo Avenue, Barangaroo, NSW 2000, Australia.



SHOUT
SHARE **IT**

Introduction

Insulin resistance and stress hyperglycemia are common in acute and critical illness.^{1,2} Whereas hyperglycemia is associated with worse outcomes in critically ill patients,³⁻⁸ this might indicate a causal relationship or that hyperglycemia and its degree are markers of severity of illness.^{2,9} The landmark trials of Van den Berghe and colleagues that compared intensive insulin therapy targeting normoglycemia with acceptance of hyperglycemia in critically ill adults provided evidence in favor of a causal relationship.¹⁰⁻¹² In these trials, targeting normoglycemia was associated with reduced mortality in patients in surgical intensive care units (ICUs)¹⁰ and reduced morbidity in patients in medical ICUs.¹² However, these results have not been replicated by other investigators.¹²⁻³⁹ Notably, the NICE SUGAR (Normoglycaemia in Intensive Care Evaluation and Survival Using Glucose Algorithm Regulation) trial, which recruited 6104 adult patients in 42 ICUs in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States, reported that targeting normoglycemia was associated with increased 90-day mortality.²⁶ Subsequent trial-level meta-analyses did not support the use of intensive insulin therapy targeting normoglycemia,^{11,40-42} and this was reflected in clinical practice guidelines that recommended tolerating hyperglycemia up to a blood glucose concentration of 180 mg/dl (10.0 mmol/l) and targeting a blood glucose concentration of 140 to 180 mg/dl (7.7 to 10.0 mmol/l) when treatment with insulin was started; these recommendations persist to this day.⁴³

Hypotheses advanced for the discordant results of randomized trials of intensive glucose control in critically ill patients included heterogeneity of effect in subgroups of patients with different clinical characteristics or premorbid conditions,^{8,44,45} interaction with feeding regimens, notably parenteral nutrition,⁴¹ differing accuracy of blood glucose monitoring devices,^{46,47} method of blood sampling for blood glucose measurement, and experience of the nursing staff managing blood glucose.⁴⁸ With the possible exception of the interaction of intensive glucose control with feeding regimens,^{49,50} these hypotheses have not been tested in randomized controlled trials. Trial-level meta-analyses have limited ability to explore subgroups' effects, whereas meta-analysis of individual patient data

allows patients to be allocated to subgroups even when those subgroups were not explored in the individual trials and allows checking and verification of the results of the included trials. We conducted an individual patient data meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of intensive glucose control in critically ill adults to estimate the effect of intensive glucose control on mortality overall and in prespecified subgroups.⁵¹

Methods

PROTOCOL AND REGISTRATION

This systematic review was preregistered in PROSPERO (CRD42021278869) and is reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Individual Participant Data (PRISMA-IPD).⁵² The study was designed by the authors and adheres to a published protocol,⁵¹ the data were gathered by the authors and analyzed by The George Institute for Global Health Biostatistics and Data Science Division, and the authors vouch for the data and analysis and wrote and made the decision to publish the article.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

We included randomized clinical trials of critically ill adults (18 years of age or older) that compared outcomes in those randomly assigned intravenous insulin administration to target a blood glucose concentration of 120 mg/dl or less (≤ 6.6 mmol/l) versus those assigned to a higher blood glucose target using intravenous insulin and where the blood glucose target was maintained for the duration of intensive care unit stay or a minimum of 7 days. We excluded trials conducted in coronary care or stroke units, those using glucose-insulin-potassium infusions, and where loss to follow-up exceeded 10% by hospital discharge.

SEARCH STRATEGY AND TRIAL SELECTION

Electronic searches in MEDLINE, EMBASE, CCTR, clinical trials.gov, and the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry were conducted from the initiation of the project until February 12, 2024 (Supplementary method S1 and statistical analysis plan in the Supplementary Appendix); we set a cut-off date of June 1, 2023, by which in-principle agreement to share the data had to be obtained from the trial's principal investigator for their data to be included in the analysis. The eligibility of

identified trials was assessed independently by two of five reviewers (Y.L., R.C., R.V., S.M., and D.A.), and disagreements were resolved by a sixth reviewer (S.F.).

DATA COLLECTION AND INTEGRITY

Individual patients' data were requested from all trials identified in the search. We requested trialists send us their study database; data were amalgamated into a single database at The George Institute for Global Health (Australia). Data quality and the integrity of the combined database were assessed by replicating the primary analysis of each trial and comparing it with the published results of each trial; trialists were informed of any discrepancies that were resolved by consensus.

Trial-level data for trials that did not provide individual patient data were extracted independently by two authors and any discrepancies were resolved by agreement.

DATA ITEMS

The individual participants' data requested from the collaborating trialists and definitions of the data points are listed in the Supplementary Appendix (Supplementary method S2). In brief, we requested data on patient demographics, nature and severity of critical illness, advanced life-support treatments before and after enrollment, and management of blood glucose and outcome data. Additionally, we requested data on the practices of ICUs contributing data to the individual trials, specifically their method of blood glucose measurement within the ICU, site of blood sampling for glucose measurements, type of insulin infusion system, and parenteral feeding policy at the time of the trial.

OUTCOMES

The primary outcome was in-hospital mortality censored at 90 days. Secondary outcomes included survival to 90 days after randomization, proportion of patients treated with mechanical ventilation, vasoactive agents (inotropic agents or vasopressors), new renal replacement therapy, and the time to alive cessation of those treatments. Severe hypoglycemia, defined as a blood glucose concentration of less than 40 mg/dl (<2.2 mmol/l), was a safety outcome.

SUBGROUP ANALYSES

Subgroup analyses were only performed for the primary outcome in subgroups characterized by individual patients' prerandomization variables and hospital or trial-level variables. Prespecified patients' characteristics were operative

(admitted to the ICU direct from the operating room or recovery room) versus nonoperative patients (all others), prior diagnosis of diabetes or not, sepsis at baseline or not, acute brain injury or not, and severity of illness below median versus above or equal to median. Post hoc, we performed a subgroup analysis based on patients' sex as recorded in the original trial databases. ICU or trial characteristics defining subgroups were early parenteral feeding policy or not, type of blood glucose monitoring and insulin infusion device, site of blood sampling for glucose monitoring, unit experience with intensive glucose control by ICU (number of patients treated with intensive glucose control in each ICU within trial), and control group target classified as intermediate (target of 180 mg/dl [10 mmol/l] or less) or higher. Full details of prespecified subgroups and hypothesized direction of treatment effect are given in Supplementary method S3 and the protocol provided with the full text of this article at evidence.nejm.org.⁵¹

RISK OF BIAS ASSESSMENT AND CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE

Risk of bias in the included studies and certainty of the review evidence was assessed using the Cochrane risk of bias tool and the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) approach for assessing certainty.^{53,54} For the plain-language description of treatment effects, time to event analyses were converted to the proportion of participants alive and free of intervention to day 90 using the method of Tierney et al.⁵⁵ (Supplementary method S4).

ETHICAL SECONDARY USE OF TRIAL DATA

We adopted the principles of the Cochrane Handbook with respect to the use of individual patient data in meta-analyses; the handbook states, "In most cases participants will not have specifically consented to inclusion (of their data) in the meta-analysis. However, as the meta-analysis is posing the same research question as, and is essentially updating, the trial they did consent to, the usual view is that separate consent is not required. However, it is advisable that data received are anonymised." In keeping with this principle, our meta-analysis addressed the same question as the trials for which we have data, and all data were anonymized before transfer.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

We followed two main approaches. First, we used a one-stage approach pooling the individual patient data and fitting hierarchical models that include trial as a random

effect. For the main binary outcome, we used a hierarchical log-binomial model to estimate a pooled risk ratio and its 95% confidence interval (CI). Additionally, to account for possible convergence issues we also attempted to fit hierarchical Poisson or logistic models (therefore presenting results as rate ratios or odds ratios, respectively). For the time-to-event analyses, we used mixed-effects parametric survival-time models (shared frailty Cox regression with frailty at trial level) with a conditional distribution of the response given the random effects assumed to be a Weibull distribution and results presented as conditional hazard ratios. We used maximum likelihood estimation with Laplace approximation in hierarchical log binomial models for binary outcomes and penalized partial likelihood estimation in frailty Cox regression models for time-to-event outcomes. Subgroup analysis of each covariate was performed based on a single multilevel/hierarchical log binomial model where trial was specified as a random effect, and an interaction term between treatment and a subgroup covariate of interest was included in addition to these main effects.

Base case models were based on (hierarchical) univariable regressions with only treatment as a fixed-effect covariate. As sensitivity analyses, we assessed multivariable models to adjust for potential confounding factors that include the following predefined variables: sex, age, baseline blood glucose concentration, ICU admission type, diagnosis of diabetes mellitus, and severity of illness.

Second, we pooled aggregate data of all eligible trials and performed a Bayesian random-effects meta-analysis. The results of the non-high risk of bias trials for which individual participant data were not available were used to create a meta-analytic prior distribution for the effect size. This historical/objective prior, combined with a vaguely informative prior for the between-trial variance, informed a Bayesian analysis of the aggregate data of the trials for which individual participants' data were available. The resulting posterior distribution of the mean effect size allowed the estimate of the probability that intensive glucose control is associated with a lower (or higher) mortality.

For the primary outcome of death during index hospital admission we also assessed the robustness of the results using a two-stage approach, first calculating summary results of the individual trials for which individual participants' data were available and then pooling those results using an appropriate meta-analytic model. For the latter we fitted a random effects model based on a Sidik-Jonkman-Hartung-Knapp estimate of the between-trial standard deviation (τ). For time-to-live

cessation of mechanical ventilation, inotropic agents, or vasopressors, and of new treatment with renal replacement therapy, we assessed subhazard ratios by fitting a competing risks model with death as a competing event. Where data were missing we provide the denominator for the analysis; we did not impute missing data. Other than tests for heterogeneity for subgroups, analyses were not adjusted for multiplicity. The statistical analysis plan was finalized before the final data set was analyzed. Statistical analyses were performed using R (for the Bayesian meta-analysis using the package *bayesmeta*)⁵⁶ and Stata version 18 (StataCorp LLC).

Results

TRIAL SELECTION AND INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANTS' DATA OBTAINED

Our search identified 14,726 unique reports of which 38 published between 2001 and 2023 met inclusion criteria (n=29,537 trial participants)^{10,12-39,50,57-65}; of these, 20 trials contributed individual patients' data (n=14,171 eligible participants out of a total of 15,773 enrolled).^{13,15,17-23,25-27,29-31,34,35,57,58,65} Individual participants ineligible due to age or identifiable subgroups assigned to ineligible treatments were excluded (Tables S1 and S2). Of the 18 trials (n=13,692 participants) for which we did not obtain individual participants' data, four (n=472 participants) were adjudicated to be at high risk of bias^{59-61,63} and were excluded from shaping the prior probability for the Bayesian analysis. Publication dates ranged from 2001 to 2023. The PRISMA flow diagram and reasons for exclusion of trials are presented in [Figure 1](#).

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INCLUDED TRIALS AND TRIAL PARTICIPANTS

The characteristics of the trials that did and did not contribute individual participants' data are presented in Tables S1 and S2. Data integrity checks of the individual participants' data found discrepancies in the reporting of deaths in seven trials. Details of these discrepancies and their resolution are shown in Table S3. The baseline characteristics of the participants included in the individual patient data meta-analysis are shown in [Table 1](#) and Table S4.

RISK OF BIAS WITHIN TRIALS

The results of the risk of bias assessment for the trials for which we aggregate data and individual patients' data are provided in Tables S5 and S6, respectively. Of the 20 trials with individual participants' data, one was judged to be of




Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram.

IPD denotes individual patients' data; and PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses.

high risk of bias²²; of the 18 trials without individual patients' data four were judged to be of high risk of bias.^{59-61,63}

PRIMARY OUTCOME

The primary outcome of in-hospital death within 90 days was available for 7059 and 7049 participants allocated to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively. Of these 1930 (27.3%) and 1891 (26.8%) participants assigned to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively, died (risk ratio, 1.02; 95% CI, 0.96 to 1.07;

P=0.52). The result was unchanged in the models that included hospital as a random effect and six predefined covariates as fixed effects (Table 2 and Table S7); the certainty of evidence was judged to be moderate (Table 3). We found no evidence of publication bias (Fig. S1) and the two stage analysis yielded similar results (Fig. S2).

Analysis of the 14 trials for which we only had aggregated data yielded a pooled risk ratio for in-hospital death of 0.94 (95% CI, 0.74 to 1.20; I², 71.4%) (Fig. S3). This trial-set

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of Patients.*		
Characteristics	Intensive Glucose Control (N=7076)	Conventional Glucose Control (N=7064)
Age, years — mean (SD)	59.7 (17.5)	59.8 (17.1)
Age — missing	66 (0.9%)	70 (1.0%)
Female sex — n/N (%)	2543/7018 (36.2)	2579/7006 (36.8)
Body mass index† — mean (SD)	27.2 (7.0)	27.2 (6.6)
Body mass index — missing	878 (12.4%)	892 (12.6%)
Operative admissions — n/N (%)	2599/6723 (38.7)	2622/6723 (39.0)
Nonoperative admissions — n/N (%)	4124/6723 (61.3)	4101/6723 (61.0)
Diabetes mellitus — n/N (%)	1334/6726 (19.8)	1411/6711 (21.0)
Sepsis at randomization — n/N (%)	1223/4595 (26.6)	1193/4599 (25.9)
APACHE II score — mean (SD)	20.1 (8.09)	20.2 (8.36)
SAPS II score — mean (SD)	51.8 (18.96)	51.8 (19.43)
APACHE II or SAPS II score — missing	466 (6.6%)	451 (6.4%)
Vasopressor treatment — n/N (%)	2513/4663 (53.9)	2511/4684 (53.6)
Mechanical ventilation — n/N (%)	4641/5175 (89.7)	4609/5198 (88.7)
Renal replacement therapy — n/N (%)	314/4386 (7.2)	309/4407 (7.0)
Blood glucose concentration (mg/dl) — mean (SD)	158.2 (69.9)	158.0 (63.6)
Blood glucose concentration (mmol/L) — mean (SD)	8.78 (3.88)	8.77 (3.53)
Blood glucose concentration — missing	525 (7.4%)	523 (7.4%)
Parenteral nutrition strategy‡ — n/N (%)	1010/6540 (15.4)	1009/6522 (15.5)
Type of glucose monitoring device — n/N (%)		
≥80% bedside point of care meter	4298/7076 (60.7)	4234/7064 (59.9)
≥80% laboratory or blood gas analyzer	1519/7076 (21.5)	1549/7064 (21.9)
Site of blood sampling — n/N (%)		
Arterial or central venous (≥80%)	4407/6540 (67.4)	4430/6522 (67.9)
Predominantly capillary (≥80%)	419/6540 (6.4)	388/6522 (5.9)
Mixed	1714/6540 (26.2)	1704/6522 (26.1)
Experience with intensive insulin treatment — n/N (%)§		
Lower tertile of ICUs	268/7076 (3.8)	293/7064 (4.1)
Middle tertile of ICUs	1145/7076 (16.2)	1181/7064 (16.7)
Upper tertile of ICUs	5663/7076 (80.0)	5590/7064 (79.1)
Insulin infusion through syringe driver — n/N (%)	4804/7076 (67.9)	4770/7064 (67.5)
Insulin infusion through volumetric pump — n/N (%)	2272/7076 (32.1)	2294/7064 (32.5)
Conventional glucose control target — n/N (%)		
High (>180 mg/dl)	1379/7076 (19.5)	1369/7064 (19.4)
Intermediate (180 mg/dl or less)	5697/7076 (80.5)	5695/7064 (80.6)

* Additional details are presented in Table S4. Operative refers to patients admitted to the ICU directly from the operating or recovery room after surgery and nonoperative refers to all others. Trials that did not supply data by variable: Age: Wang 2006; Sex: Wang 2006; Body mass index (BMI): Wang, Oksanen, Zhang, Annane, Green, Cappi; Admission type: Wang, Zhang, Green, Cappi; Diabetes: Mitchell, Wang; Sepsis: Wang, Mackenzie, Zhang, Preiser, Green, Kalfon, Bohe; Trauma: Wang, Savioli, Annane, Cappi, Kalfon; Traumatic brain injury: Mitchell, Wang, Zhang, Preiser, Savioli, Annane, Cappi, Kalfon, Bohe; Severity of illness (APACHE II or SAPS II score): Bilotta, Green, Savioli; Vasopressor: Hoedemaekers, Mitchell, Wang, Oksanen, Arabi 2008, De La Rosa, Zhang, Green, Arabi 2011, Cappi, Kalfon; Mechanical ventilation: Wang, De La Rosa, Zhang, Cappi, Kalfon; Renal replacement therapy: Hoedemaekers, Wang, Brunkhorst, De La Rosa, Zhang, Preiser, Green, Cappi, Kalfon; Blood glucose: Hoedemaekers, Wang, Oksanen, Brunkhorst; Parenteral feeding strategy: Preiser; Glucose monitoring device: none; Site of blood sampling: Preiser; Unit experience with intensive glucose control: none; Type of insulin infusion device: none. APACHE II denotes Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II score, a severity of illness score with values from 0 to 71 with higher scores indicating an increased risk of death; ICU, intensive care unit; SAPS II, Simplified Acute Physiology II, a severity of illness score with values from 0 to 163 with higher scores indicating an increased risk of death; and SD, standard deviation.

† Body mass index is calculated as the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters.

‡ Strategy to deliver at least 400 kcal per day as intravenous glucose or parenteral nutrition during first 72 hours of treatment in ICU.

§ Experience was graded as the number of patients treated with intensive glucose control in each ICU within the trial whose data are used.

NEJM EVIDENCE

6

NEJM Evidence is produced by NEJM Group, a division of the Massachusetts Medical Society.

Downloaded from evidence.nejm.org on June 12, 2024. For personal use only.

No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2024 Massachusetts Medical Society. All rights reserved.
For personal use only. No other uses without permission. Copyright © 2024 Massachusetts Medical Society.

Outcome	No. of Trials Contributing Data	Participants Assigned Intensive Control	Participants Assigned Conventional Control	Effect Estimate	95% CI or 95% CrI	P Value
Primary Outcome						
One-stage analysis of IPD						
Risk ratio (model 1 — primary analysis)*	20	7059	7049	1.02	0.96–1.07	0.52
Risk ratio (model 2)†	20	5683	5677	1.02	0.95–1.09	
Risk ratio (model 3)	20	7059	7049	1.02	0.97–1.08	
Risk ratio (model 4)†	20	5683	5677	1.02	0.95–1.10	
Two-stage analysis of IPD trials	20	7059	7049	1.00	0.92–1.09	
Bayesian analysis‡	20	7059	7049	1.00	0.92–1.08 (CrI)	
Secondary Outcomes						
Survival at day 90	20	7060	7048	1.03 (hazard ratio)	0.97–1.10	
Proportion of patients treated with mechanical ventilation	18	6785	6777	1.00 (risk ratio)	0.97–1.04	
Time to alive cessation of mechanical ventilation (hours)	18	6238	6191	1.00 (hazard ratio)	0.96–1.04	
Proportion of patients treated with inotropic agents or vasopressors	14	6366	6376	1.01 (risk ratio)	0.96–1.05	
Time to alive cessation of inotropic agents or vasopressors (hours)	13	4115	4094	0.96 (hazard ratio)	0.91–1.00	
Proportion of patients newly treated with renal replacement therapy	11	4373	4394	1.08 (risk ratio)	0.96–1.22	
Time to alive cessation of new renal replacement therapy (hours)	9	403	370	0.93 (hazard ratio)	0.79–1.10	
Adverse Events						
Incidence of severe hypoglycemia§	20	7018	7023	3.38 (risk ratio)	2.99–3.83	<0.0001

* Model 1: Outcome ~ Treatment (fixed effect) + Trial (random effect). Model 2: Outcome ~ Treatment (fixed effect) + Trial (random effect) + six predefined covariates (fixed effects). Model 3: Outcome ~ Treatment (fixed effect) + Trial/Hospital (two-level random effect). Model 4: Outcome ~ Treatment (fixed effect) + Trial/Hospital (two-level random effect) + six predefined covariates (fixed effects). All secondary outcomes are from model 1. Intervals have not been corrected for multiplicity. CI denotes confidence interval; CrI, credible interval; and IPD, individual patients' data.

† The number of participants was reduced due to missing covariate data.

‡ The Bayesian analysis uses the objective prior, which is the prior probability derived from the eligible studies for which we did not have individual patients' data (Figs. S3 and S4).

§ Severe hypoglycemia = blood glucose concentration <40 mg/dl (<2.2 mmol/l).

shaped the meta-analytic prior for the Bayesian meta-analysis and yielded a pooled effect for the primary outcome of 1.00 (95% credible interval, 0.92 to 1.08); I^2 19.6%; posterior probability that intensive glucose control is superior to conventional glucose control of 48.5% (Table 2 and Figs. S4 and S5). The results were similar using a flat/vague prior: pooled risk ratio of 1.01 (95% credible interval, 0.92 to 1.09), I^2 of 19.1%, and posterior probability of intensive glucose control superior to conventional glucose control of 42.8% (Table S7 and Figs. S4 and S5). The certainty of evidence was judged to be moderate (Table 3).

The results of the two-stage analysis were similar; the risk ratio for in-hospital death for intensive glucose control compared with conventional glucose control was 1.02 (95% CI, 0.97 to 1.07) (Table 2 and Table S7).

PRIMARY OUTCOME IN SUBGROUPS

Results for the primary outcome in subgroups are given in Figure 2A and 2B. There was no apparent heterogeneity of the treatment effect in any of the subgroups characterized by individual patient characteristics (Fig. 2A), or by ICU or trial-level characteristics (Fig. 2B).

Outcome	Effect Estimate (95% CI), No. of Trials, and No. of Participants	Absolute Effect Estimates (No. of Participants)		Certainty of Evidence (Quality of the Evidence)	Plain-Language Summary
		Intensive Glucose Control (95% CI)	Conventional Glucose Control		
In-hospital mortality	Risk ratio of 1.02 (0.96–1.07) 20 trials 14,108 participants	273 per 1000 5 more per 1000 (6 fewer to 16 more)	268 per 1000	Moderate‡	Intensive glucose control probably has little to no effect on in-hospital mortality
Survival to 90 days after randomization	Hazard ratio of 1.03 (0.97–1.10) 20 trials 14,108 participants	289 per 1000† 7 more per 1000 (7 fewer to 23 more)	282 per 1000†	Moderate‡	Intensive glucose control probably has little to no effect on survival to 90 days
Proportion treated with mechanical ventilation	Risk ratio of 1.00 (0.97–1.04) 18 trials 13,562 participants	926 per 1000 0 fewer per 1000 (28 fewer to 37 more)	926 per 1000	Moderate‡	Intensive glucose control probably has no effect on the proportion of patients who receive mechanical ventilation
Time to alive cessation of mechanical ventilation	Hazard ratio of 1.00 (0.96–1.04) 18 trials 12,429 participants	840 per 1000† 0 fewer per 1000 (12 fewer to 11 more)	840 per 1000†	Moderate§	Intensive glucose control probably has no effect on the proportion of patients who are alive and free of mechanical ventilation to day 90
Proportion of patients treated with inotropes/vasopressors	Risk ratio of 1.01 (0.96–1.05) 14 trials 12,742 participants	650 per 1000 6 more per 1000 (26 fewer to 32 more)	644 per 1000	Moderate‡	Intensive glucose control probably has little to no effect on the proportion of patients treated with inotropes/vasopressors
Time to alive cessation of inotropes/vasopressor	Hazard ratio of 0.96 (0.91–1.00) 13 trials 8,209 participants	837 per 1000† 12 fewer per 1000 (28 fewer to 0 fewer)	849 per 1000†	High	Intensive glucose control is associated with slightly fewer patients alive and free of vasopressors to day 90
Proportion of patients newly treated with renal replacement therapy	Risk ratio of 1.08 (0.96–1.22) 11 trials 8,767 participants	106 per 1000 8 more per 1000 (4 fewer to 22 more)	98 per 1000	Moderate‡	Intensive glucose control probably has little to no effect on the proportion of patients newly treated with renal replacement therapy
Time to alive cessation of new treatment with renal replacement therapy	Hazard ratio of 0.93 (0.79–1.10) 9 trials 773 participants	734 per 1000† 25 fewer per 1000 (84 fewer to 32 more)	759 per 1000†	Moderate‡	Intensive glucose control probably has little to no effect on the proportion of patients alive and free of renal replacement therapy to day 90
Incidence of severe hypoglycemia (blood glucose <40 mg/dl [<2.2 mmol/l])	Risk ratio of 3.38 (2.99–3.83) 20 trials 14,041 participants	133 per 1000 94 more per 1000 (78 more to 112 more)	39 per 1000	Moderate¶	Intensive glucose control is probably associated with an increase in the incidence of severe hypoglycemia

* The population consisted of critically ill adults treated in an intensive care unit. The intervention consisted of intensive insulin therapy with a blood glucose target of ≤ 6.6 mmol/l (≤ 120 mg/dl). The intervention was compared to conventional insulin therapy with a blood glucose target of >6.6 mmol/l (>120 mg/dl). CI denotes confidence interval.

† Time to event analyses (hazard ratios) was converted to absolute risk of the event of interest occurring within 90 days of randomization (see Supplementary method S4).

‡ The 95% CIs do not exclude patient important differences.

§ Heterogeneity in the results evidenced by $I^2=73.6\%$.

¶ Heterogeneity in the results evidenced by $I^2=70.0\%$.




Figure 2. Results for the Primary Outcome in Subgroups.

After correction for multiple hypothesis testing there was no apparent heterogeneity of the treatment effect in any of the subgroups characterized by individual patient characteristics (Panel A), or by ICU or trial-level characteristics (Panel B). APACHE II denotes Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II; CI, confidence interval; CGC, conventional glucose control; ICU, intensive care unit; IGC, intensive glucose control; and SAPS II, Simplified Acute Physiology Score II.

SECONDARY OUTCOMES

Data on vital status and time to death at day 90 were available for 7060 and 7048 participants assigned to intensive glucose control and conventional glucose control, respectively; of these, 2056 (28.3%) and 1990 (28.3%) participants assigned to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively, had died (survival analysis hazard ratio, 1.03; 95% CI, 0.97 to 1.10) ([Table 2](#) and Fig. S6).

The proportion of participants treated with mechanical ventilation was 6308/6785 (93.0%) and 6273/6777 (92.6%) for intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively (risk ratio, 1.00; 95% CI, 0.97 to 1.04) ([Table 2](#) and Table S7). Data on time to alive cessation of mechanical ventilation were available for 6238 and 6191 participants assigned to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively (hazard ratio, 1.00; 95% CI, 0.96 to 1.04) ([Table 2](#) and Fig. S7).

The proportion of participants treated with inotropic agents or vasopressors was 4133/6366 (64.9%) and 4109/6376 (64.4%) assigned to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively (risk ratio, 1.01; 95% CI, 0.96 to 1.05) ([Table 2](#) and Table S7). Data on time to alive cessation of vasoactive agents were available for 4115 and 4094 participants assigned to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively (hazard ratio, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.91 to 1.00) ([Table 2](#) and Fig. S8).

The proportion of participants newly treated with renal replacement therapy was 465/4373 (10.6%) and 431/4394 (9.8%) assigned to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively (risk ratio, 1.08; 95% CI, 0.96 to 1.22) ([Table 2](#) and Table S7). Data on time to alive cessation of renal replacement therapy were available for 403 and 370 participants assigned to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively (hazard ratio, 0.93; 95% CI, 0.79 to 1.10) ([Table 2](#) and Fig. S9).

The two-stage analysis of proportions treated with mechanical ventilation, inotropic agents, or vasopressors and newly treated with renal replacement therapy yielded similar results (risk ratio [95% CIs], 1.00 [1.00 to 1.01], 1.00 [0.98 to 1.02], and 1.08 [0.96 to 1.22], respectively) (Figs. S10 to S12).

Analysis of time to alive cessation of mechanical ventilation and inotropic or vasopressor agents and new renal

replacement therapy treating death as a competing event produced similar results (subhazard ratio [95% CI], 1.00 [0.94 to 1.04], 0.96 [0.92 to 1.00], and 0.92 [0.79 to 1.08], respectively) (Table S7 and Figs. S13 to S15). Certainty of evidence was judged high for time to alive cessation of inotropes/vasopressors and moderate for all other secondary outcomes ([Table 3](#)).

SAFETY OUTCOME

In pooled individual participants' data, severe hypoglycemia (blood glucose concentration of less than 40 mg/dl; less than 2.2 mmol/l) occurred in 933/7018 (13.3%) and 277/7023 (3.9%) participants assigned to intensive and conventional glucose control, respectively (risk ratio, 3.38; 95% CI, 2.99 to 3.83; $P < 0.0001$) ([Table 2](#) and Table S7).

Discussion

This patient-level meta-analysis found that intensive glucose control did not reduce in-hospital death in critically ill patients. The result was robust, being unaltered by multivariable analyses and consistent in a Bayesian analysis informed by the data from trials from which we did not obtain patient-level data. We did not find a subgroup of patients who benefitted from intensive glucose control or that ICU practices in the conduct of glucose control or feeding policies affected the results. The use of intensive glucose control markedly increased the risk of severe hypoglycemia.

Our findings on the overall effect of intensive glucose control are consistent with those of trial-level meta-analyses^{11,40-42} but add additional analyses of possible effect modifiers. Our finding that the effect was not substantively modified by the feeding policies of the ICUs in which patients were recruited appears to contradict the conclusion of a meta-analysis with meta-regression that concluded that beneficial and detrimental effects of intensive glucose control were dependent on the proportion of calories delivered as parenteral nutrition.⁴¹ Early use of parenteral nutrition was standard treatment in the participants of the first two trials conducted by Van den Berghe and colleagues,^{10,12} and subsequently the same group investigated the role of early versus late initiation of parenteral nutrition in patients undergoing intensive glucose control and found that late initiation of parenteral nutrition was associated with faster recovery and fewer complications.⁴⁹ Most recently a large randomized trial from the same group reported that intensive glucose control

conferred no mortality benefit in critically ill patients not receiving early parenteral nutrition.⁵⁰ We used a threshold of 400 kcal per day during the first 72 hours of ICU treatment to define early parenteral nutrition; this is less than in the trials of Van den Berghe and colleagues, which aimed to deliver 20 to 30 kcal/kg body weight, with almost all those calories being delivered parenterally during the first 3 days.^{10,12} Our analysis can neither confirm nor refute the hypothesis that the apparent benefit of intensive glucose control in critically ill patients receiving early high-dose parenteral nutrition results from increased control group mortality from untreated feeding-induced hyperglycemia. That intensive glucose control use in critically ill patients is associated with an increase in risk of severe hypoglycemia has been reported in previous randomized trials and meta-analyses; our analysis of patient-level data confirms that finding.

The strengths of our study include following a predefined protocol and statistical analysis plan, a comprehensive literature search, repeated efforts to contact the authors of all eligible studies, obtaining full trial data sets from contributing trialists, reanalyzing those data to check for discrepancies against published results, and resolving any discrepancies that were found.

Our study's main weakness was not obtaining patient-level data from all eligible trials. We addressed this by using the results of the trials from which we did not have data to inform the prior probability of a Bayesian analysis. Additionally, we limited our study to critically ill adults and cannot comment on the possible benefits or harms of intensive glucose control in critically ill children. Our subgroup analyses may have had inadequate statistical power to exclude clinically important effects and we cannot exclude heterogeneity of treatment effect based on subgroups or endotypes that can be identified with emerging analytic techniques.⁶⁶ Our analysis was also dependent on and potentially limited by the internal and external validity of the included data, which were generated over more than 20 years.

In conclusion, intensive glucose control was not associated with reduced mortality or other benefits in critically ill adults. We did not identify any subgroup of patients in whom intensive glucose control was beneficial.

Our study supports current recommendations to tolerate mild hyperglycemia in all critically ill adults, with insulin

treatment being reserved for those in whom blood glucose exceeds 180 mg/dl (10.0 mmol/l) and adopting a blood glucose target of 140 to 180 mg/dl (7.8 to 10.0 mmol/l) in those patients who are treated with intravenous insulin.^{43,67,68}

Disclosures

Funded by Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (Project Grant number 632809); Canadian Institutes of Health Research (RCT application number 154708); by an Investigator Grant (Leadership Level 3 APP2017580) from National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia (to Dr. Finfer); by an Emerging Leader Investigator Grant from the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia APP1196320 (to Dr. Hammond); by a Chair in Knowledge Translation in the ICU from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (to Dr. Cook); by "Programme d'Investissements d'Avenir" (PIA), reference ANR-18-RHUS-0004, and French Ministry of Health Programme Hospitalier de Recherche Clinique (PHRC), contract number PHRC-20-0778 (to Dr. Annane).

Author disclosures and other supplementary materials are available at evidence.nejm.org.

Requests for access to data should be directed to the investigators of the included trials who retain ownership of their data. The authors of this meta-analysis do not have legal authority to share those data.

Author Affiliations

- ¹ Critical Care Division, The George Institute for Global Health, Sydney
- ² Department of Critical Care, Melbourne Medical School, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
- ³ Medical School, Faculty of Medical Sciences, University College London, London
- ⁴ Department of Intensive Care, Austin Health, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
- ⁵ Royal North Shore Hospital, Malcolm Fisher Department of Intensive Care, St Leonards, NSW, Australia
- ⁶ The George Institute for Global Health, Biostatistics and Data Science Division, Barangaroo, NSW, Australia
- ⁷ Department of Intensive Care, Hôpital Raymond-Poincaré, Garches, France
- ⁸ PROMETHEUS IHU, Université Paris-Saclay, Garches, France
- ⁹ Laboratory of Infection & Inflammation, School of Medicine Simone Veil Santé, Université Paris-Saclay, Montigny Le Bretonneux, France
- ¹⁰ FHU SEPSIS (Saclay and Paris Seine Nord Endeavour to Personalize Interventions for Sepsis), Garches, France
- ¹¹ Intensive Care Medicine, King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
- ¹² Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, University of Rome La Sapienza, Rome
- ¹³ Service d'Anesthésie-Réanimation-Médecine Intensive, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Groupement Hospitalier Sud, Lyon, France
- ¹⁴ Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, Jena University Hospital, Jena, Germany
- ¹⁵ HCor Research Institute, São Paulo, Brazil
- ¹⁶ Departments of Medicine, Clinical Epidemiology & Biostatistics (Division of Critical Care), McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

- ¹⁷ Institute for Medical Informatics, Statistics and Epidemiology, Leipzig University, Leipzig, Germany
- ¹⁸ Department of Neurology, Tufts University School of Medicine, Boston
- ¹⁹ Department of Critical Care Medicine, Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing
- ²⁰ Faculty of Medicine, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
- ²¹ Department of Intensive Care Medicine, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
- ²² Anestesiologia e Rianimazione, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan
- ²³ La Casamance Private Hospital, Aubagne, France
- ²⁴ Hospital Pablo Tobon Uribe, Medellín, Colombia
- ²⁵ School of Science, Western Sydney University, Campbelltown, NSW, Australia
- ²⁶ InterSystems Corporation, Cambridge, MA
- ²⁷ Faculty of Medicine and Health, Northern Clinical School, The University of Sydney, St Leonards, NSW, Australia
- ²⁸ Faculté de Médecine, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels
- ²⁹ Office of Research and Education, Canberra Health Services Library, Canberra, ACT, Australia
- ³⁰ School of Medicine and Psychology, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia
- ³¹ Division of Intensive Care Medicine, Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, HUS Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki
- ³² Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan
- ³³ Erasme University Hospital, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels
- ³⁴ Departamento de Clínica Médica-Emergências Clínicas, Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo
- ³⁵ CareFlight Australia, Wentworthville, NSW, Australia
- ³⁶ Department ICU, The First Affiliated Hospital, Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou, China
- ³⁷ Department of Critical Care Medicine, School of Clinical Medicine, Beijing Tsinghua Changgung Hospital, Tsinghua University, Beijing
- ³⁸ Department of Business Economics, Health and Social Care, University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland, Lugano, Switzerland
- ³⁹ Department of Clinical Care, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland
- ⁴⁰ Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of New South Wales, Randwick, NSW, Australia
- ⁴¹ School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London

References

1. Saberi F, Heyland D, Lam M, Rapson D, Jeejeebhoy K. Prevalence, incidence, and clinical resolution of insulin resistance in critically ill patients: an observational study. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 2008;32:227-235. DOI: [10.1177/0148607108316195](#).
2. Kavanagh BP, McCowen KC. Clinical practice. Glycemic control in the ICU. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:2540-2546. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMcip1001115](#).
3. Salim A, Hadjizacharia P, Dubose J, et al. Persistent hyperglycemia in severe traumatic brain injury: an independent predictor of outcome. *Am Surg* 2009;75:25-29. DOI: [10.1177/000313480907500105](#).
4. Taylor JH, Beilman GJ. Hyperglycemia in the intensive care unit: no longer just a marker of illness severity. *Surg Infect (Larchmt)* 2005;6:233-245. DOI: [10.1089/sur.2005.6.233](#).
5. Krinsley JS. Association between hyperglycemia and increased hospital mortality in a heterogeneous population of critically ill patients. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2003;78:1471-1478. DOI: [10.4065/78.12.1471](#).
6. Capes SE, Hunt D, Malmberg K, Pathak P, Gerstein HC. Stress hyperglycemia and prognosis of stroke in nondiabetic and diabetic patients: a systematic overview. *Stroke* 2001;32:2426-2432. DOI: [10.1161/hs1001.096194](#).
7. Capes SE, Hunt D, Malmberg K, Gerstein HC. Stress hyperglycemia and increased risk of death after myocardial infarction in patients with and without diabetes: a systematic overview. *Lancet* 2000;355:773-778. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(99\)08415-9](#).
8. Falciglia M, Freyberg RW, Almenoff PL, D'Alessio DA, Render ML. Hyperglycemia-related mortality in critically ill patients varies with admission diagnosis. *Crit Care Med* 2009;37:3001-3009. DOI: [10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181b083f7](#).
9. Henderson WR, Chittock DR, Dhingra VK, Ronco JJ. Hyperglycemia in acutely ill emergency patients — cause or effect? *CJEM* 2006;8:339-343. DOI: [10.1017/S1481803500014007](#).
10. Van den Berghe G, Wouters P, Weekers F, et al. Intensive insulin therapy in critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:1359-1367. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMoa011300](#).
11. Van den Berghe G, Wilmer A, Hermans G, et al. Intensive insulin therapy in the medical ICU. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354:449-461. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMoa052521](#).
12. Wiener RS, Wiener DC, Larson RJ. Benefits and risks of tight glucose control in critically ill adults: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2008;300:933-944. DOI: [10.1001/jama.300.8.933](#).
13. Hoedemaekers CW, Pickkers P, Netea MG, van Deuren M, Van der Hoeven JG. Intensive insulin therapy does not alter the inflammatory response in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting: a randomized controlled trial [ISRCTN95608630]. *Crit Care* 2005;9:R790-R797. DOI: [10.1186/cc3911](#).
14. Yu WK, Li WQ, Wang XD, et al. [Influence and mechanism of a tight control of blood glucose by intensive insulin therapy on human sepsis]. *Zhonghua Wai Ke Za Zhi* 2005;43:29-32.
15. Mitchell I, Knight E, Gissane J, et al. A phase II randomised controlled trial of intensive insulin therapy in general intensive care patients. *Crit Care Resusc* 2006;8:289-293. DOI: [10.1016/S1441-2772\(23\)02060-4](#).
16. Azevedo JR, Lima ER, Cossetti RJ, Azevedo RP. Intensive insulin therapy versus conventional glycemic control in patients with acute neurological injury: a prospective controlled trial. *Arq Neuropsiquiatr* 2007;65:3b:733-738. DOI: [10.1590/S0004-282X2007000500001](#).
17. Oksanen T, Skrifvars MB, Varpula T, et al. Strict versus moderate glucose control after resuscitation from ventricular fibrillation. *Intensive Care Med* 2007;33:2093-2100. DOI: [10.1007/s00134-007-0876-8](#).
18. Brunkhorst FM, Engel C, Bloos F, et al. Intensive insulin therapy and pentastarch resuscitation in severe sepsis. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:125-139. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMoa070716](#).

19. Bilotta F, Caramia R, Cernak I, et al. Intensive insulin therapy after severe traumatic brain injury: a randomized clinical trial. *Neurocrit Care* 2008;9:159-166. DOI: [10.1007/s12028-008-9084-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12028-008-9084-9).
20. De La Rosa GdelC, Donado JH, Restrepo AH, et al. Strict glycaemic control in patients hospitalised in a mixed medical and surgical intensive care unit: a randomised clinical trial. *Crit Care* 2008;12:R120. DOI: [10.1186/cc7017](https://doi.org/10.1186/cc7017).
21. Mackenzie I, Ercole A, Blunt M, Ingle S, Palmer C. Glycaemic control and outcome in general intensive care: the East Anglian GLYCOGENIC study. *Br J Intens Care* 2008;18:121-126.
22. Zhang R, He W, Li T, et al. Evaluation of optimal goal of glucose control in critically ill patients. *Chinese J Clin Nutr* 2008;16:204-208.
23. Preiser JC, Devos P, Ruiz-Santana S, et al. A prospective randomised multi-centre controlled trial on tight glucose control by intensive insulin therapy in adult intensive care units: the Glucontrol study. *Intensive Care Med* 2009;35:1738-1748. DOI: [10.1007/s00134-009-1585-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-009-1585-2).
24. Taslimi R, Azizkhani R, Talebian MH, et al. The efficacy of intensive glucose management on hospitalized critically ill patients associated mortality rate in intensive care unit. *Daru* 2009;17:157-162.
25. Cavalcanti AB, Silva E, Pereira AJ, et al. A randomized controlled trial comparing a computer-assisted insulin infusion protocol with a strict and a conventional protocol for glucose control in critically ill patients. *J Crit Care* 2009;24:371-378. DOI: [10.1016/j.jcrc.2009.05.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2009.05.005).
26. Finfer S, Chittock DR, Su SY, et al. Intensive versus conventional glucose control in critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:1283-1297. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMoa0810625](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa0810625).
27. Savioli M, Cugno M, Polli F, et al. Tight glycemic control may favor fibrinolysis in patients with sepsis. *Crit Care Med* 2009;37:424-431. DOI: [10.1097/CCM.0b013e31819542da](https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e31819542da).
28. Yang M, Guo Q, Zhang X, et al. Intensive insulin therapy on infection rate, days in NICU, in-hospital mortality and neurological outcome in severe traumatic brain injury patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2009;46:753-758. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.01.004).
29. Annane D, Cariou A, Maxime V, et al. Corticosteroid treatment and intensive insulin therapy for septic shock in adults: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2010;303:341-348. DOI: [10.1001/jama.2010.2](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2010.2).
30. Green DM, O'Phelan KH, Bassin SL, Chang CW, Stern TS, Asai SM. Intensive versus conventional insulin therapy in critically ill neurologic patients. *Neurocrit Care* 2010;13:299-306. DOI: [10.1007/s12028-010-9417-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12028-010-9417-3).
31. Arabi YM, Tamim HM, Dhar GS, et al. Permissive underfeeding and intensive insulin therapy in critically ill patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2011;93:569-577. DOI: [10.3945/ajcn.110.005074](https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.110.005074).
32. Cao SG, Ren JA, Shen B, Chen D, Zhou YB, Li JS. Intensive versus conventional insulin therapy in type 2 diabetes patients undergoing D2 gastrectomy for gastric cancer: a randomized controlled trial. *World J Surg* 2011;35:85-92. DOI: [10.1007/s00268-010-0797-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-010-0797-5).
33. Mahmoodpoor A, Ali-Asgharzadeh A, Parish M, Amir-Aslanzadeh Z, Abedini N. A comparative study of efficacy of Intensive Insulin Therapy versus conventional method on mortality and morbidity of critically ill patients. *Pak J Med Sci* 2011;27:496-499.
34. Cappi SB, Noritomi DT, Velasco IT, Curi R, Loureiro TC, Soriano FG. Dyslipidemia: a prospective controlled randomized trial of intensive glycemic control in sepsis. *Intensive Care Med* 2012;38:634-641. DOI: [10.1007/s00134-011-2458-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-011-2458-z).
35. Kalfon P, Giraudeau B, Ichai C, et al. Tight computerized versus conventional glucose control in the ICU: a randomized controlled trial. *Intensive Care Med* 2014;40:171-181. DOI: [10.1007/s00134-013-3189-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-013-3189-0).
36. Hamimy W, Khedr H, Rushdi T, Zaghloul A, Hosni M, Abdel Aal A. Application of conventional blood glucose control strategy in surgical ICU in developing countries: Is it beneficial? *Egypt J Anaesth* 2016;32:123-129. DOI: [10.1016/j.egja.2015.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egja.2015.05.002).
37. Wang Y, Li JP, Song YL, Zhao QH. Intensive insulin therapy for preventing postoperative infection in patients with traumatic brain injury: A randomized controlled trial. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2017;96:e6458. DOI: [10.1097/MD.0000000000006458](https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000006458).
38. Mohod V, Ganeriwai V, Bhange J. Comparison of intensive insulin therapy and conventional glucose management in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting. *J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol* 2019;35:493-497. DOI: [10.4103/joacp.JOACP_61_17](https://doi.org/10.4103/joacp.JOACP_61_17).
39. Santana-Santos E, Kanke PH. Impacto do controle glicêmico intensivo na lesão renal aguda: ensaio clínico randomizado (Impact of intensive glycemic control on acute renal injury: a randomized clinical trial). *Acta Paul Enferm* 2019;32:592-599. DOI: [10.1590/1982-0194201900083](https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0194201900083).
40. Griesdale DEG, de Souza RJ, van Dam RM, et al. Intensive insulin therapy and mortality among critically ill patients: a meta-analysis including NICE-SUGAR study data. *CMAJ* 2009;180:821-827. DOI: [10.1503/cmaj.090206](https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.090206).
41. Marik PE, Preiser JC. Toward understanding tight glycemic control in the ICU: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *Chest* 2010;137:544-551. DOI: [10.1378/chest.09-1737](https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.09-1737).
42. Kansagara D, Fu R, Freeman M, Wolf F, Helfand M. Intensive insulin therapy in hospitalized patients: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;154:268-282. DOI: [10.7326/0003-4819-154-4-201102150-00008](https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-154-4-201102150-00008).
43. ElSayed NA, Aleppo G, Aroda VR, et al. 16. Diabetes care in the hospital: standards of care in diabetes — 2023. *Diabetes Care* 2023;46:Suppl 1:S267-S278. DOI: [10.2337/dc23-S016](https://doi.org/10.2337/dc23-S016).
44. Egi M, Bellomo R, Stachowski E, et al. The interaction of chronic and acute glycemia with mortality in critically ill patients with diabetes. *Crit Care Med* 2011;39:105-111. DOI: [10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181feb5ea](https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181feb5ea).
45. Egi M, Bellomo R, Stachowski E, et al. Blood glucose concentration and outcome of critical illness: the impact of diabetes. *Crit Care Med* 2008;36:2249-2255. DOI: [10.1097/CCM.0b013e318181039a](https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e318181039a).

46. Kanji S, Buffie J, Hutton B, et al. Reliability of point-of-care testing for glucose measurement in critically ill adults. *Crit Care Med* 2005;33:2778-2785. DOI: [10.1097/01.CCM.0000189939.10881.60](https://doi.org/10.1097/01.CCM.0000189939.10881.60).
47. Corstjens AM, Ligtenberg JJ, van der Horst IC, et al. Accuracy and feasibility of point-of-care and continuous blood glucose analysis in critically ill ICU patients. *Crit Care* 2006;10:R135. DOI: [10.1186/cc5048](https://doi.org/10.1186/cc5048).
48. Van den Berghe G, Schetz M, Vlasselaers D, et al. Clinical review: intensive insulin therapy in critically ill patients: NICE-SUGAR or Leuven blood glucose target? *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2009;94:3163-3170. DOI: [10.1210/jc.2009-0663](https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2009-0663).
49. Casaer MP, Mesotten D, Hermans G, et al. Early versus late parenteral nutrition in critically ill adults. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:506-517. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMoa1102662](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1102662).
50. Gunst J, Debaveye Y, Güiza F, et al. Tight blood-glucose control without early parenteral nutrition in the ICU. *N Engl J Med* 2023;389:1180-1190. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMoa2304855](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2304855).
51. Adigbli D, Yang L, Hammond N, et al. Intensive glucose control in critically ill adults: a protocol for a systematic review and individual patient data meta-analysis. *Crit Care Sci* 2023;35:345-354. DOI: [10.5935/2965-2774.20230162-en](https://doi.org/10.5935/2965-2774.20230162-en).
52. Stewart LA, Clarke M, Rovers M, et al. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses of individual participant data: the PRISMA-IPD Statement. *JAMA* 2015;313:1657-1665. DOI: [10.1001/jama.2015.3656](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2015.3656).
53. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.l4898](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4898).
54. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;336:924-926. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD).
55. Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Ghersi D, Burdett S, Sydes MR. Practical methods for incorporating summary time-to-event data into meta-analysis. *Trials* 2007;8:16. DOI: [10.1186/1745-6215-8-16](https://doi.org/10.1186/1745-6215-8-16).
56. Röver C. Bayesian random-effects meta-analysis using the bayes-meta R package. *J Stat Software* 2020;93:1-51. DOI: [10.18637/jss.v093.i06](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v093.i06).
57. Arabi YM, Dabbagh OC, Tamim HM, et al. Intensive versus conventional insulin therapy: a randomized controlled trial in medical and surgical critically ill patients. *Crit Care Med* 2008;36:3190-3197. DOI: [10.1097/CCM.0b013e31818f21aa](https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e31818f21aa).
58. Bohé J, Abidi H, Brunot V, et al. Individualised versus conventional glucose control in critically-ill patients: the CONTROLLING study-a randomized clinical trial. *Intensive Care Med* 2021;47:1271-1283.
59. Desai SP, Henry LL, Holmes SD, et al. Strict versus liberal target range for perioperative glucose in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2012;143:318-325. DOI: [10.1016/j.jtcvs.2011.10.070](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2011.10.070).
60. Grey NJ, Perdrizet GA. Reduction of nosocomial infections in the surgical intensive-care unit by strict glycemic control. *Endocr Pract* 2004;10(Suppl 2):46-52. DOI: [10.4158/EP.10.S2.46](https://doi.org/10.4158/EP.10.S2.46).
61. Gupta R, Bajwa SJS, Abraham J, Kurdi M. The efficacy of intensive versus conventional insulin therapy in reducing mortality and morbidity in medical and surgical critically ill patients: a randomized controlled study. *Anesth Essays Res* 2020;14:295-299. DOI: [10.4103/aer.AER_62_20](https://doi.org/10.4103/aer.AER_62_20).
62. He W, Zhang TY, Zhou H, et al. [Impact of intensive insulin therapy on surgical critically ill patients]. *Zhonghua Wai Ke Za Zhi* 2007;45:1052-1054.
63. He Z-Y, Li NF, Xing J, Wu Y. The effect of intensive insulin therapy on short term outcome in critically ill patients. *Chin J Clin Nutr* 2008;16:220-222.
64. Iapichino G, Albicini M, Umbrello M, et al. Tight glycemic control does not affect asymmetric-dimethylarginine in septic patients. *Intensive Care Med* 2008;34:1843-1850. DOI: [10.1007/s00134-008-1158-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-008-1158-9).
65. Wang LC, Lei S, Wu YC, et al. [Intensive insulin therapy in critically ill patients]. *Zhongguo Wei Zhong Bing Ji Jiu Yi Xue* 2006;18:748-750.
66. Gordon AC, Alipanah-Lechner N, Bos LD, et al. From ICU syndromes to ICU subphenotypes: consensus report and recommendations for developing precision medicine in ICU. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2024 April 30 (Epub ahead of print) DOI: [10.1164/rccm.202311-2086SO](https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.202311-2086SO).
67. Evans L, Rhodes A, Alhazzani W, et al. Surviving sepsis campaign: international guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock 2021. *Intensive Care Med* 2021;47:1181-1247. DOI: [10.1007/s00134-021-06506-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-021-06506-y).
68. Honarmand K, Sirimaturos M, Hirshberg EL, et al. Society of Critical Care Medicine guidelines on glycemic control for critically ill children and adults 2024: executive summary. *Crit Care Med* 2024;52:649-655. DOI: [10.1097/CCM.0000000000006173](https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000006173).